



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22312-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,283	08/28/2001	Christopher J. Bradford	IN-5520	8390
26922	7590	11/06/2003	EXAMINER	
BASF CORPORATION ANNE GERRY SABOURIN 26701 TELEGRAPH ROAD SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034-2442			BERMAN, SUSAN W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A2

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/941,283	Applicant(s) BRADFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner Susan W Berman	Art Unit 1711	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 29 September 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
 2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
 4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached page(s).
 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
 7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: 8,7 and 15-17.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,8-14 and 18-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
 10. ☒ Other: IDS filed 6-19-03

IDS filed 9-28-03 (4 pages)

Susan W Berman
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 1711

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)
009/941,283

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the new issue is the absence of UV curable functional groups in the thermally curable binder.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): rejection of claims over Lahrmann et al, rejection of claims 6, 7 and 15-17 under obviousness type double patenting.

Art Unit: 1711

Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach the UV/TH ratio set forth in the instant claims. This argument is persuasive with respect to Larhmann et al because the Examples teach using a large percentage of UV curable component to thermally curable component. However, this argument is not persuasive with respect to the teaching of Sirkoch et al or DE 99141. Each of Sirkoch et al and DE '141, as discussed in the Final Rejection of record, discloses compositions in the Examples wherein the ratio of UV curable component to thermally curable component is within the instantly claimed range. See the weights of UV curable and thermally curable components used in the Examples. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of ordinary skill in the art would have been expected to look at the examples within the references for guidance formulating compositions according to patentees disclosure. Thus, the examples provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide compositions within the limitations set forth in the instant claims. Furthermore, there is no comparative data of record to show unexpected results for the ratio set forth in the instant claims that would distinguish the instantly claimed invention from the prior art teaching.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan W Berman whose telephone number is 703 308 0040. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 703 308 2462. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0661.



Susan W Berman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711